

BSEP PLANNING & OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE MINUTES

February 24, 2015

BUSD Offices –Technology Room 126
2020 Bonar Street, Berkeley, CA 94702

P&O Committee Members Present:

Lily Howell, <i>Pre-K (Alt)/Malcolm X</i>	Marian Bradley-Kohr, <i>King</i>
Madhu Marchesini, <i>Arts Magnet</i>	Bruce Simon, <i>King (co-Chair)</i>
Dawn Paxson, <i>Emerson/Willard</i>	Alma Prins, <i>Longfellow (Alt)</i>
Terry Pastika, <i>Jefferson (Alt)</i>	Aaron Glimme, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Danielle Perez, <i>John Muir (co-Chair)</i>	Larry Gordon, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Catherine Huchting, <i>Malcolm X</i>	John Lavine, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Molly Jo Alaimo, <i>Oxford (Alt)</i>	Catherine Lazio, <i>Berkeley High</i>
Patrick Hamill, <i>Thousand Oaks</i>	Christine Staples, <i>Berkeley High (Alt)</i>

P&O Committee Members Absent:

Moshe Cohen, <i>Pre-K/Malcolm X</i>	Radha Seshagiri, <i>Thousand Oaks (Alt)</i>
Bill Fleig, <i>Cragmont</i>	Mimi Leinbach, <i>Washington</i>
Martin de Mucha Flores, <i>Cragmont (Alt)</i>	Elisabeth Hensley, <i>King</i>
Shilen Patel, <i>Cragmont (Alt)</i>	Jenny Orland, <i>Longfellow</i>
Shauna Rabinowitz, <i>Jefferson</i>	Juliet Bashore, <i>Longfellow</i>
Yusef Auletta, <i>LeConte</i>	Kim Sanders, <i>Longfellow (Alt)</i>
Ananda Esteva, <i>LeConte (Alt)</i>	Rhonda Jefferson, <i>Berkeley High (Alt)</i>
Octavio Munist, <i>LeConte (Alt)</i>	Max Cramer, <i>Berkeley High Student Rep</i>
Lea Baechler-Brabo, <i>Oxford</i>	John Fike, <i>BTA/B-Tech</i>
Laura Babitt, <i>Rosa Parks</i>	Louise Harm, <i>Independent Study</i>

Visitors, School Board Directors, Union Reps, and Guests:

Donald Evans, *BUSD Superintendent*
Jay Nitschke, *Director of Technology*
Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent, Educational Services*
Ty Alper, *BUSD School Board Director*
Cathy Campbell, *President, BFT/Berkeley Federation of Teachers*
Mark Coplan, *BUSD Public Information Officer*

BSEP Staff:

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*
Valerie Tay, *BSEP Program Specialist*
Linda Race, *BSEP Staff Support*

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Site Reports

At 7:16 p.m. Co-chair Danielle Perez called the meeting to order by welcoming attendees and asking them to introduce themselves. Members were asked to give brief site reports, including site survey status.

2. Establish the Quorum/Approve Agenda

The quorum was established. 16 voting members were present. 13 voting members are required for a quorum.

MOTION CARRIED (Paxson/Glimme): To approve the agenda of the February 24, 2015 P&O Committee Meeting. Beery suggested that Item 9. BSEP Measure Planning be moved forward to Item 8. **The motion was unanimously approved.**

3. Chairperson's Comments

Co-Chairs Danielle Perez and Bruce Simon

Simon noted that *Item 10. For the Good of the Order* was added to the agenda to accommodate any business or feedback from committee members.

4. BSEP Director's Comments

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

Beery provided the following handouts:

- *Friends of the BUSD Library Flyer for March 2, 2014 Meeting*
- *Crowe Horwath BUSD, Measure A of 2006 BSEP, Financial Statements, dated June 30, 2014*
- *Crowe Horwath BUSD, Measure A of 2006 BSEP, Performance Audit, dated June 30, 2014*

Birthday wishes were given to Co-chair Perez by Beery and the Committee.

Beery noted the following items:

- She would be handing out the BSEP Site Allocations for next year at the Principals meeting to be held on February 25, 2015. She noted that the per pupil allocation would remain the same as last year at \$230. This would leave enough of a fund balance until the end of the Measure. Currently, the fund balance is approximately \$90,000.

Pat Saddler, Director of Special Projects, will disseminate information about categorical funds, such as Title I, that will be considered alongside these BSEP Site Allocations.

- In addition to the current BSEP Measure (known as Fund 4), there were prior BSEP Measures (known as Funds 5 through 8) from the 1994 and 2004 Measures that still have very small amounts of money in them. Beery noted that the amount was just a few thousand dollars. She stated that she was working on shifting expenses to close them out.
- There will be a Friends of BUSD Libraries meeting on March 2, 2014 (see flyer handout) and a Music/VAPA meeting on the same day.
- Beery provided handouts of the Crowe Horwath BSEP Financial Statements and Performance Audit. The discussion for these will be held at the next meeting.
- The current SGC bylaws are being worked on by Beery and Tay. An email will be sent out to the committee members asking specific questions as to their thoughts about how elections or SGCs have been run and how they might be improved by some clarifications or changes in the bylaws, e.g., clarification on alternates.

- Beery stated that the Hillside Sale funds were used for one-time only expenditures. Gordon noted that the numbers did not match in two different documents.

5. Approval of P&O Minutes of February 10, 2014

MOTION CARRIED (Glimme/Prins): To approve the meeting minutes of the February 10, 2014 P&O Committee Meeting. **The motion was approved with a showing of 15 hands, with 0 objections, and 1 abstention.**

6. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

7. Recommendation for BSEP Funds in FY 2015-16: Class Size Reduction

Pasquale Scuderi, *Assistant Superintendent*

The following handouts were provided:

- *BUSD Class Size Reduction FTE Planning Document FY 2015-16 Proposed Budget v2015-02-24/BSEP CSR Multi Year Projections Based on CSR Recommendations for FY 2015-15 v2015-02-24 (3 pages total)*

Scuderi presented the CSR and noted that the information he was presenting on CSR for FY 2015-16 needed refinement. Scuderi began by explaining the CSR Staffing Enrollment by Grade (at the top of the page for TK-Kindergarten), the General Fund contribution to get CSR to 34:1, the contribution from Measure A (BSEP) to get CSR to 20:1, and Measure A Necessary FTE to round up numbers to real whole persons. Scuderi noted that the Measure A Necessary FTE totals 3.93 (bottom of page 1) and thinks this is currently a high number. Before he returns with a final recommendation, he needs to look at grade level groups at each school and make sure the numbers of FTE allocated in the proposal is accurate and where possible trimmed to drop down the Measure A Necessary FTE.

Scuderi noted that page 2 and 3 of the handout should be reviewed together. He pointed out the negative projected ending fund balances (-\$95,000 and -\$307,943) at the bottom of page 3 were being reviewed by Deputy Superintendent Cleveland. Scuderi stated that there would be some deficits to make up, which means that difficult decisions might have to be made to cut programs. He noted that those programs were noted in detail on the middle of page 2 (ECO for BHS and Middle Schools, Middle School Counseling Services and Program Support, with details listed below that). They are looking for places and resources to absorb some of the cuts as they refine the recommendation.

Question/Responses:

- Of the TK-K enrollment, 135-150 would be TK. The TK number could fluctuate as parents decide whether or not to keep their children in pre-school.
- Is the One-time Contribution from GF included in the Projected Ending Fund Balance? No, on page 3, that is left blank. So another \$95,000 would need to be found to fill the projected deficit? Yes, if these numbers stay stable. If the FTE decreases, then that would drop the deficit.
- Can LCAP pick up any of the program support services? It is one of the things that will be looked at and will be part of the discussion.
- The Step Increase for teachers at the top of page 3 is standard. Beery noted that step increase is a time factor and would always be in the projection.

- It was noted that the line item for the 3% Reserve was removed at Deputy Superintendent Cleveland's suggestion, because it gave the false idea that the money could be used. It is now outside the projected budget.
- The COLA increase is separate from a salary increase. Salary increases are not included in these figures because they are subject to future negotiations. Salary increases could not be layered in proactively, because negotiations are unknown. The step salary, however, is fixed. Beery noted that the COLA number is out of our control and comes from the State. The COLA is presented to the Board and they decide if it is adopted. That drives a portion of the revenues in the next year (by adjusting the tax rate). Indirect costs (overhead costs) are a calculation also determined by the State.
- The GF absorbed half of the cost of the RTI² this year and Special Ed absorbed half of the RTI² last year.
- Is the objective to run the Measure out to -0- by the end of the Measure? Yes, as long as the 3% reserve remains untouched. The small remaining funds from past Measures (Funds 5 through 8) has been kept open pay for things like a lagging rebate. Beery will return with information about clearing out those funds at a future meeting. She noted that the funds need to be expended for what they were designated for.
- It was noted that there were higher enrollment numbers for TK-K and Middle School and that the "bubbles" could be followed.

8. BSEP Measure Planning

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

The following handouts were provided:

- *BSEP and Related Committees (meeting calendar)*
- *BSEP Measure Planning Questions*

Beery presented the *BSEP and Related Committees (meeting calendar)* that shows the intersection of various committees and BSEP fund interests. She noted the items highlighted in green had a direct relationship to BSEP Measure Planning. The BSEP Measure Planning Group would be meeting February 25th to discuss how to use existing structures such as the P&O, EAC, and/or create new work groups to focus on key overarching questions that would do more research and create white papers.

Beery announced that there could be new community partners for BSEP Measure Planning. Beery has been speaking with a faculty member at the Goldman School for Public Policy and the Center for Civility and Democratic Engagement and to the UC/Berkeley School of Education about possible research or process support.

Beery wanted the committee members to think of ideas and questions that we would need to know to make more informed decisions about BSEP. What is the research, data, funding, ideas, perspectives that could be added to the BSEP Measure discussion.

- CSR: What is the value of CSR? Is there any empirical data about CSR efficacy, in particular around Math?
- Could Parent Outreach funding help with childcare so parents can be more engaged with BSEP?
- Why are we not funding materials for the high school music program just as we are for the middle schools?

- Parent Outreach: Middle school parent outreach offers some unique issues, but the PTA and SGCs are struggling with some of them. Are there new models and new ways to be considered? Communications besides newsletters and e-trees that are cohesive? What works, and can we make a change to reach all the families we need to?
- Is there data on effectiveness of programs, program support? There is not enough data for some programs. Some people are asking “What is this for?” It was noted that the previous measures were much more restrictive, and the current measure is more flexible.
- What is the community’s vision for technology in this district? Although it has been a multi-funded budget and BUSD is known as a world-class/21st century school district, technology is playing an increased role in education, and it was felt we had a ways to go in this area. The music program has also had tremendous growth. Does the district have a clear vision of where it wants to go with BSEP funds/any funds that are allocated? It was noted that in budgeting for technology, like music, the costs are not static, as there are ongoing costs for upgrading, repairing and training etc.
- When BSEP was established, were there proposed outcomes established for any of these current categories? No, the way it was written the funds were to be expended for certain purposes and metrics were not included. It was noted that there were some metrics for targeted class sizes, but not for student achievement. Currently how does the district track the assessment process? District indicators would be graduation rates, credits completed at the end of each semester toward graduation rates, and 3rd grade reading emphasis this year. How will the annual data evolve in the era of the SBA/Smarter Balanced Assessment? There is a complex conversation now about math assessments with the new math curriculum. There are some standards and engagement measures that will be looked at such as attendance, graduation rates, and reading assessments.
- With the change to core curriculum what is the differentiation with math as well as other areas, what’s the current research value, what is the actual change in curriculum and how are the teachers handling it? In what way could BSEP dollars support differentiation, class size etc.? Between CSR and Program Support, where does it fit? (Staff development etc.) How does it complement what we have to do and how it gets funded by Common Core/BSEP/LCAP? In a full-inclusion district, differentiation is happening anyway. Special Ed students are staying (instead of being placed in non-public schools) and general ed teachers are differentially teaching students. It was noted that there was not good research on class size but with the Measure, there are CSR metrics because of clearly stated goals and yearly reports of how those goals are met or not met. The teacher template shows that without the BSEP funds, the average K class size would be 34 and the average class size at the high school would be 36, which would mean there would be class sizes in the low 40s. Beery added that we get rewards from the state for lowered class size. The way the district and the current class sizes are set up the funds keep the class size reasonable, which helps with differentiation. It was noted that for the voters, regardless of the research, class size reduction is important. BSEP buys CSR and Music which students in other districts don’t get.
- If UC/Berkeley and Public Policy students are involved, can they look at districts with larger class sizes and how are those students are performing in comparison with districts with lower class size to provide tangible outcomes without being onerous.

- As much as class size helps with differentiation, there is variable quality among teachers and since there is some money that goes to PD, again a multi-funded program, it would be helpful to have a clearer idea of what we spend money on as far as the PD plan.
- K-5 PE is mostly funded by other sources (PTA), but could we cover them? This brought up a brief discussion about the length of the school year in general/comparisons with other countries.
- Is there research for smaller class sizes resulting in socio-emotional benefits?
- Is there any research for good teachers and smaller class size? Good teachers are the most important. In other countries, providing a social safety net and teachers who are valued/paid well, are things we don't do. Is that because those countries have national accreditation programs or the homogenous nature to some of those societies that make it easier to implement?
- Do we have data for actual percentages for CSR and would \$1M be a reasonable cushion? Without suggesting a reduction in program support etc., is there a way to have leftover monies put in a discretionary fund that is overseen by a larger group? The question is about separating those two pots.
- How do our goals align with the 2020 Vision? It may be a more explicit piece that explains how BSEP contributes to those goals.
- Are there other models for Parent Outreach out there? Other models have been researched, and have we looked at those? How does our Family Engagement match up with other models?

Beery stated that she would like to create a living document for this (perhaps a Google document) and/or a Google Form survey and noted that she would use the input to inform the P&O subcommittee discussions. This information would go to the larger work groups for class size and program development. It would have to be determined which would be the best umbrellas for these work groups that are working on major district initiatives.

It was noted that since we may lose funds from the split roll tax, we would have to make some tough decisions about what the rate of the tax is and determining whether to keep it the same or radically adjusting it. The big picture discussion would have to do with educational purposes or the budget available to support those educational purposes. The GF will be growing because of the growing base funding from the state.

Is there any thought about doing a sample survey to find out what people's interest or comfort level might be for an increased parcel tax? Yes, an independent polling firm would be engaged as was done before. Those surveys would find out what people would be willing to pay for. The school district would pay for the survey.

It was confirmed that the LCAP funding is given to the districts year by year. The goal is that we would receive \$15.9M by 2021, but it is not guaranteed and there could be huge swings from that goal year to year. It makes it hard to plan.

9. BSEP Awareness: Logo Refresh

Natasha Beery, *BSEP Director*

The following handouts were provided:

- *BSEP Logo concepts, 2 pages.*

Beery presented concepts for a new BSEP logo. The communications team took the input from the committee and the design was kept simple. It would likely appear on library books, corners of music programs, and banners. The feedback from the committee was positive.

10. For the Good of the Order

- Paxson noted that she had the idea around PE to include Movement into Music and Performing Arts. There was a discussion around the OUSD PE lawsuit and the minimum amount of time for PE mandated for elementary school students.
- Glimme noted that what was important for teachers was time for collaboration and preparation, grading etc. He stated that in other countries, teachers were given more hours for preparation and grading at a level of one hour of teaching to one hour of prep time, while he had 5 hours of teaching to one hour of prep time. Glimme felt this changed teaching in a fundamental way.
- Pastika noted that if there was a shift in PE to having General Ed teachers provide PE, how would the curriculum be implemented? One person noted that at Chabot in Oakland, they had 30 minutes to one hour of PE a week as release time and 10 minutes a day of whole school movement (dance, calisthenics).
- Paxson noted that while the students with individual needs get their exercise, the whole class could be doing movement with them (Adaptive PE).
- It would be beneficial for BUSD to make any PE audits public.
- Information from the district about how the school day is structured would be important for voters to know.
- Subcommittees are open for all P&O members to participate.
- PE meets the LCAP goals for student engagement and school climate.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by acclamation at 9:00 p.m.

The next P&O meeting will be held March 10, 2015.

Minutes submitted by Linda Race, BSEP Staff Support